

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE**

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------|
| CAROL MURPHY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Docket No. 1:06-cv-62-GZS |
| |) | |
| STATE OF MAINE, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, RESTRAINING ORDER &
RECUSAL**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief, Restraining Order and Recusal (Docket # 121). To the extent this Motion seeks relief against Judge Woodcock, the Court considers the Motion MOOT in light of Judge Woodcock's recent Order of Recual (Docket # 115). All other arguments and requests of relief contained in this particular motion are groundless and frivolous. For that reason, the Motion is hereby DENIED.

FURTHER NOTICE TO PLAINTIFF

This latest filing is another example of Plaintiff seeking relief that has already been denied via previous motions. Plaintiff would be well advised to stop filing frivolous motions seeking injunctive relief and focus her efforts on the merits of her case. In its Order dated September 25, 2006 (Docket # 116), this Court explained the standard for injunctive relief and Plaintiff's latest filing makes no attempt to address this standard. Ms. Murphy is hereby specifically CAUTIONED that any additional requests for injunctive relief that this Court deems to be similarly frivolous will likely result in an injunction against Ms. Murphy preventing her from filing further motions for injunctive relief. See Cok v. Family Court of Rhode Island, 985 F.2d 32, 35 (1st Cir. 1993).

SO ORDERED.

/s/ George Z. Singal
United States Chief District Judge

Dated on this 3rd day of October 2006.